



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/825,622	04/15/2004	Sean Allen Johnson	SVL920040562US2	7882

55070 7590 08/17/2007  
INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORP.  
IP LAW  
555 BAILEY AVENUE, J46/G4  
SAN JOSE, CA 95141

EXAMINER
----------

JOHNSON, JOHNESE T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2166

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/17/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/825,622	<b>Applicant(s)</b> JOHNSON ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Johnese Johnson	<b>Art Unit</b> 2166	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 August 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 24-27, 29-32, 39-45, 48 and 50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 24-27, 29-32, 39-45, 48, and 50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some    \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 2166

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Remarks***

1. In light of searching and consideration, newly found art is presented in the rejection below.

### ***Claim Objections***

2. Claim 45 is objected to because of the following informalities: The claim depends from claim 34, which has been cancelled. The examiner believes that claim should depend from claim 39 and will interpret it as such. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1-13, 24-27, 29-32, 39-45, 48, and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

On page 5 of applicant's specification, the components of the software system

Art Unit: 2166

"... comprises four modules..." that can be used to create various structures or complete various tasks. On page 7, the system is comprised of nodes which appear to be links or URLs to link or refer to a content item in a workflow system. On page 8, a workflow system is referenced. On pages 5-6, 8-12, 17, and 19-20, an API is referenced. Although the specification gives examples of what the API does, it never clearly defines the API. It is unclear to the examiner as to what are the actual components of the system.

With respect to the nodes of the system, there are inconsistencies in the nodes exact definition. On page 7 of applicant's specification, "each node can be one of many types including a link to a folder in a content repository, link to content,...". However, on page 12 of applicant's specification, "A node is generally either an entity defined by unique subject identifier or is a piece of external information defined by a unique subject address that can be resolved with a locator". The examiner is not sure if the node is an actual entity/ content or just a link to the content.

Lastly, how do all of these parts or "components" of the system function together? The specification merely discloses descriptions of the various parts or "components" but it fails to disclose how the nodes, workflow systems , etc., work together to accomplish real-time delivery from disparate content repositories.

There simply isn't enough support in the specification to run this "system". One of ordinary skill in the art would not know how to create or use the invention absent further description.

Art Unit: 2166

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1, 2, 3, 12, 13, 24, 39, 48, and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 2, 3, 12, and 13 all recite, "... and/or ...". It is unclear to the examiner What is being addressed/ claimed. For example, in claim 3, "wherein the existing organization, functions, indexing, and security of the content, content organizing structures, work items, **and/or** work organizing structures are not impacted by the creation" is recited. The examiner is unable to ascertain if all items are not impacted or if both "work items" and "organizing structures" aren't impacted or if "work items" are impacted then "work organizing structures" are not impacted. Further clarification is required.

Claims 1, 24, 39, 48, and 50 are directed to nodes/ links, workflow systems, disparate repositories, and that are all connected via middleware and have associations and locators without any functionality present. For example, in claims 24 and 50, locators are recited. These locators appear to only provide a mere description of the links or pointers to various entities without performing any actions. The claims appear to be narrative in form without any functionality present.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Art Unit: 2166

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-13, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The content of these claims is directed to a computer system. Although the claims state that the system is comprised a processor and software components, the processor, according to page 18, lines 1-2, the processor is just a plug-in module or software. The specification, on page 5, line 21, states that the system, itself, is software. Software modules or *software per se* is non-functional descriptive material. When non-functional descriptive material is recorded on a computer readable medium, it is not statutory. (See MPEP 2106.01 [R-5]).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-9, 11, 24-31, and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hobbs (US Pat. No. 6,523,022).

As to claims 1 and 48, Hobbs discloses:

Art Unit: 2166

a processor (see col. 1, line 47); and

a memory (see col. 9, line 61) comprising:

an application program interface (API), executable by said processor, to interface with a software application (see col. 7, line 1); and

a virtual repository comprising a plurality of nodes, a first node of the plurality of nodes linking to a work item of a first workflow system of the plurality of workflow systems, a second node of the plurality of nodes linking to a work item of a second workflow system of the plurality of workflow systems, a third node of the plurality of nodes linking to a work organizing structure of the first workflow system, a fourth node of the plurality of nodes linking to a work organizing structure of the second workflow system (see col. 1, lines 20-42; wherein the plurality of links in which the examiner is interpreting as nodes, are linked to content within the data warehouse which is used to manage the multimedia content), a fifth node of the plurality of nodes linking to a content of a first content repository of said plurality of disparate content repositories (see col. 1, lines 20-42; wherein the data warehouse is composed of databases with links to content), a sixth node of the plurality of nodes linking to a content of a second content repository of said plurality of disparate content repositories (see col. 1, lines 20-42; and see col. 4, lines 19-20; different i.e. disparate data warehouses), a seventh node of the plurality of nodes linking to a content organizing structure of the first content repository, and an eighth node of the plurality of nodes linking to a content organizing structure of the second content repository (see col. 1, lines 20-42; wherein the data warehouse is composed of databases which are data organizing structures with links to

Art Unit: 2166

content), wherein the API provides access to the virtual repository (see col. 21, lines 41-50), wherein the work organizing structure of the first workflow system is one of: a queue and a task list, wherein the work organizing structure of the second workflow system is one of: another queue and another task list (see col. 8, lines 18-34), wherein the content organizing structure of the first content repository is a folder, wherein the content organizing structure of the second content repository is another folder (see col. 20, lines 17-27).

As to claim 2, Hobbs discloses:

wherein the content, content organizing structures, work items, and/or work organizing structures are not replicated or impacted by the creation of the at least one virtual repository (see col. 4, lines 19-22; wherein the repositories are completely different).

As to claim 3, Hobbs discloses:

wherein the existing organization, functions, indexing, and security of the content, content organizing structures, work items, and/or work organizing structures are not impacted by the creation of the at least one virtual repository (see col. 4, lines 19-22; wherein the repositories are completely different so nothing is affected).

As to claims 4 and 25, Hobbs discloses:

wherein the API is in a format selected from the group consisting of Java, Component Object Model (COM), Simple Object Protocol (SOAP) Web Services, Representational



Art Unit: 2166

State Transfer (REST) Web Services, and Web Development Components (see col. 14, lines 10-11).

As to claim 5, Hobbs disclose:

a graphical user interface or a web-based interface (see figure 8).

As to claims 6 and 26, Hobbs discloses:

wherein the nodes are arranged in a parent-child hierarchy (see col. 20, lines 17-27; directory).

As to claim 7, Hobbs discloses:

a ninth node being of the type of a virtual folder (see col. 20, lines 17-27; link to a directory),

a tenth node being of the type of a link to a folder populated by saved repository search (see col. 5, lines 13-15; wherein the results of the search are saved an a link delivered to the user's email),

an eleventh node being of a type of a link to a folder populated by a workflow system search (see col. 11, lines 40-52), and

a twelfth node being of a type of a link to an external resource via a URL (see col. 15, lines 46-48).

As to claim 8, Hobbs discloses:

Art Unit: 2166

wherein the nodes contain meta-data properties in addition to the meta-data maintained in their respective underlying said content repositories and said workflow systems, wherein the meta-data properties of the nodes describe a use of the content, content organizing structures, work items and work organizing structures of the virtual repository (see col. 1, lines 20-42 and see col. 2, lines 48-50 – information, i.e. meta-data, describing the content).

As to claim 9, Hobbs discloses:

wherein at least one content repository of the plurality of content repositories has access control rules to the content and the content organizing structures, wherein at least one workflow system of the plurality of workflow systems has access control rules to the work items and the work organizing structures, wherein the nodes of the virtual repository comprise supplemental access control rules of the virtual repository, wherein the supplemental access control rules are applied to the nodes within the virtual repository, wherein the supplemental access control rules describe supplemental security constraints to the content and content organizing structures of the at least one content repository, wherein the supplemental access control rules describe security constraints to the work items and work organizing structures of the at least one workflow system (see Col. 28, lines 42-47; wherein access control is provided to the various data warehouses and databases).

Art Unit: 2166

As to claim 11, Hobbs discloses:

further comprising a middleware platform to abstract a particular content repository of the plurality of content repositories of the virtual repository, and another middleware platform to abstract a particular workflow system of the plurality of workflow systems of the virtual repository. (see col. 14, lines 59-64).

As to claims 24 and 50, Hobbs discloses:

a processor (see col. 1, line 47); and

a memory (see col. 9, line 61) comprising:

an application program interface (API), executable by said processor, to interface with a software application (see col. 7, line 1); and

a virtual repository comprising a plurality of nodes, a first node of the plurality of nodes linking to a work item of a first workflow system of the plurality of workflow systems, a second node of the plurality of nodes linking to a work item of a second workflow system of the plurality of workflow systems, a third node of the plurality of nodes linking to a work organizing structure of the first workflow system, a fourth node of the plurality of nodes linking to a work organizing structure of the second workflow system (see col. 1, lines 20-42; wherein the plurality of links in which the examiner is interpreting as nodes, are linked to content within the data warehouse which is used to manage the multimedia content), a fifth node of the plurality of nodes linking to a content of a first content repository of said plurality of disparate content repositories (see col. 1, lines 20-42; wherein the data warehouse is composed of databases with

Art Unit: 2166

links to content), a sixth node of the plurality of nodes linking to a content of a second content repository of said plurality of disparate content repositories (see col. 1, lines 20-42; and see col. 4, lines 19-20; different i.e. disparate data warehouses), a seventh node of the plurality of nodes linking to a content organizing structure of the first content repository, and an eighth node of the plurality of nodes linking to a content organizing structure of the second content repository (see col. 1, lines 20-42; wherein the data warehouse is composed of databases which are data organizing structures with links to content), wherein the API provides access to the virtual repository (see col. 21, lines 41-50), wherein the work organizing structure of the first workflow system is one of: a queue and a task list, wherein the work organizing structure of the second workflow system is one of: another queue and another task list (see col. 8, lines 18-34), wherein the content organizing structure of the first content repository is a folder, wherein the content organizing structure of the second content repository is another folder (see col. 20, lines 17-27).

a plurality of associations describing relationships between the nodes, each association of said plurality of associations having at least two nodes that are members of that association, said each association describing a relationship between the members of that association, said each association also being a node (see col. 20, lines 17-27; wherein the content in the directory is associated by links); and

locators to reference and de-reference entities external to the system (see col. 15, lines 46-48), a first locator to a first external reference, the first locator leverages workflow integration middleware to reference said first work item of said first workflow

Art Unit: 2166

system; a second locator to a second external reference, the second locator leverages workflow integration middleware to reference said second work item from said second workflow system; a third locator to a third external reference, the third locator leverages workflow integration middleware to reference said work organizing structure of said first workflow system, a fourth locator to a fourth external reference, the fourth locator to reference said work organizing structure of said second workflow system; a fifth locator to a fifth external reference, the fifth locator leverages content integration middleware to reference said content of said first content repository; a sixth locator to a sixth external reference, the sixth locator leverages content integration middleware to reference said content of said second content repository; a seventh locator to a seventh external reference, the seventh locator leverages content integration middleware to reference said content organizing structure of said first content repository; an eighth locator to an eighth external reference, the eighth locator to reference said content organizing structure of said second content repository; and an extensible locator interface to provide a locator to another external system (see col. 14, lines 59-64; leverages middle ware and see col. 1, lines 20-42; wherein the data warehouse is composed of databases which are data organizing structures with links to content).

As to claim 27, Hobbs discloses:

wherein the plurality of nodes represent content, content organizing structures, work items and work organizing structures that will participate in relationships with information, said information for each node of the plurality of nodes comprising at least

Art Unit: 2166

one of: meta-data describing said each node, at least one role played in at least one association with another node, or more scoped names, a unique identifier of the subject of said each node, a locator of the external subject of said each node, and 0 or more node types (see col. 2, lines 48-50 – information, i.e. meta-data, describing the content).

As to claim 29, Hobbs discloses:

wherein an association has two or more members which are nodes playing a specific named role in the association (see col. 2, line 57 – database content; wherein database contents have links which are entities and entities have specific roles and relationships).

As to claim 30, Hobbs discloses:

wherein members represent the specific role a node plays in an association.

(see col. 2, line 57 – database content; wherein database contents have links which are entities and entities have specific roles and relationships).

As to claim 31, Hobbs discloses:

wherein members have a player specifying the node playing the role in the association

(see col. 2, line 57 – database content; wherein database contents have links which are entities and entities have specific roles and relationships and wherein relationships comprise members of nodes and their roles).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hobbs (US Pat. No. 6,523,022) and in view of Michaelides (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0181753).

As to claim 12, Hobbs does not explicitly disclose:

further comprising a set of adaptors to allow the system to access specific content repositories and/or workflow systems.

However, Michaelides discloses:

further comprising a set of adaptors to allow the system to access specific content repositories and/or workflow systems (see paragraph [0004, line 4 – set of adaptors for applications]).

It would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, having teachings of Hobbs and Michaelides before him/her, to combine the features as disclosed by Hobbs with the features as disclosed by Michaelides to facilitate integration between applications, systems, and processes (see Michaelides, paragraph [0002], lines 4-5).

As to claim 13, Hobbs does not explicitly disclose:

further comprising an adaptor toolkit that enables the system to build interfaces to future developed content repositories and/or workflow systems.

However, Michaelides discloses:

further comprising an adaptor toolkit that enables the system to build interfaces to future developed content repositories and/or workflow systems (see paragraph [0004], lines 10-11).

It would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, having teachings of Hobbs and Michaelides before him/her, to combine the features as disclosed by Hobbs with the features as disclosed by Michaelides to facilitate integration between applications, systems, and processes (see Michaelides, paragraph [0002], lines 4-5).

10. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hobbs (US Pat. No. 6,523,022) and in view of Brunner et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,550,971).

As to claim 32, Hobbs does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the associations have 0 or more association types, wherein the association types have logical properties describing the type of the relationship, wherein any association types comprise at least one of: an allowed cardinality of the relationship, allowed members of the relationship, required members of the relationship, a transitivity of the relationship, a delete propagation across the relationship, and a save propagation across the relationship.



However, Brunner et al. disclose:

wherein the associations have 0 or more association types, wherein the association types have logical properties describing the type of the relationship, wherein any association types comprise at least one of: an allowed cardinality of the relationship, allowed members of the relationship, required members of the relationship, a transitivity of the relationship, a delete propagation across the relationship, and a save propagation across the relationship (see col. 5, lines 66-67 and col. 6, line 1 - 3).

It would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, having teachings of Hobbs and Brunner et al. before him/her, to combine the features as disclosed by Hobbs with the features as disclosed by Brunner et al. to facilitate the generation of a user interface that is adaptable to various database systems (see Brunner et al., col. 2, lines 46-48).

11. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Hobbs (US Pat. No. 6,523,022) and in view of Johnson et al. (U.S. PG. Pug. No. 2002/0152210).

The applied reference has a common inventor with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed

Art Unit: 2166

in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing that the reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

As to claim 10, Hobbs does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the at least one virtual repository can be exported to an XML representation  
and imported from the same XML representation.

However, Johnson et al. disclose:

wherein the at least one virtual repository can be exported to an XML representation  
and imported from the same XML representation (see paragraph [0036]).

It would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, having teachings of Hobbs and Johnson et al. before him/her, to combine the features as disclosed by Hobbs with the features as disclosed by Johnson et al. to provide real-time exchange of content stored in multiple content repositories (see Johnson et al., paragraph [007], lines 5-7).

12. Claims 39-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Hobbs (US Pat. No. 6,523,022) and in view of Armstrong et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6, 279, 046).

The applied reference has a common inventor with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing that the reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

As to claim 39, Hobbs discloses:

- a processor (see col. 1, line 47); and
- a memory (see col. 9, line 61) comprising:
  - an application program interface (API), executable by said processor, to interface with a software application (see col. 7, line 1); and
  - a plurality of subscriptions to a plurality of subscribed-to-items, respectively,

wherein the API interfaces the software application to the plurality of subscriptions; the

Art Unit: 2166

subscribed-to- items comprising a first content of a first content repository, a first content organizing structure of the first content repository, a first work item of a first workflow system, a first work organizing structure of the first workflow system, a second content of a second content repository, a second content organizing structure of the second content repository, a second work item of a second workflow system, a second work organizing structure of the second workflow system ( see col. 2, lines 33-36);

wherein the subscriptions are requests to track when at least one of an addition, change and delete occurs to any of the subscribed-to-items, respectively (see col. 5, lines 37-39); and

However, Hobbs does not explicitly disclose:

an event path defined per a logical group comprising a timer, a subscription group processor that creates events based on the subscriptions in response to the timer, a content monitor that detects change based on the events, an event filter that filters uninteresting change and interesting change, and an event handler that receives the interesting change.

Armstrong et al. discloses:

an event path defined per a logical group comprising a timer, a subscription group processor that creates events based on the subscriptions in response to the timer, a content monitor that detects change based on the events, an event filter that filters uninteresting change and interesting change, and an event handler that receives the interesting change. (see col. 8, line 41).

It would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, having teachings of Hobbs and Armstrong et al. before him/her, to combine the features as disclosed by Hobbs with the features as disclosed by Armstrong et al. to provide an event-driven communications interface to support communications between multiple logical partitions in a logically portioned computer (see Armstrong et al., col. 2, line 40-42).

As to claim 40, Hobbs, do not explicitly disclose:

wherein the timer initiates periodic polling of the first and second content repositories and the first and second workflow systems to detect a change that needs notification.

However, Armstrong et al. discloses:

wherein the timer initiates periodic polling of the first and second content repositories and the first and second workflow systems to detect a change that needs notification (see col. 11, lines 61-65).

It would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, having teachings of Hobbs and Armstrong et al. before him/her, to combine the features as disclosed by Hobbs with the features as disclosed by Armstrong et al. to provide an event-driven communications interface to support communications between multiple logical partitions in a logically portioned computer (see Armstrong et al., col. 2, line 40-42).

As to claim 41, Hobbs, do not explicitly disclose:

wherein the group processor initiates events on subscriptions of a subscription group.

Art Unit: 2166

However, Armstrong et al. discloses:

wherein the group processor initiates events on subscriptions of a subscription group (see col. 11, lines 59-61).

It would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, having teachings of Hobbs. and Armstrong et al. before him/her, to combine the features as disclosed by Hobbs. with the features as disclosed by Armstrong et al. to provide an event-driven communications interface to support communications between multiple logical partitions in a logically portioned computer (see Armstrong et al., col. 2, line 40-42).

As to claim 42, Hobbs. , do not explicitly disclose:

wherein the content monitor comprises a plug-in software module for detect change in subscribed-to items.

However, Armstrong et al. discloses:

wherein the content monitor comprises a plug-in software module for detect change in subscribed-to (monitored) items (see col. 8, lines 5-10; wherein changes are tracked for those items that are monitored).

It would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, having teachings of Hobbs. and Armstrong et al. before him/her, to combine the features as disclosed by Hobbs. with the features as disclosed by Armstrong et al. to provide an event-driven communications interface to support communications between multiple logical partitions in a logically portioned computer (see Armstrong et al., col. 2, line 40-42).

Art Unit: 2166

As to claim 43, Hobbs, do not explicitly disclose:

wherein the event filter comprises plug-in modules for filtering interesting and plug-in modules that filter interesting and uninteresting changes in the subscribed-to-items, wherein the changes are filtered based on a meta-data value of at least one of the subscribed-to-items.

However, Armstrong et al. discloses:

wherein the event filter comprises plug-in modules for filtering interesting and plug-in modules that filter interesting and uninteresting changes in the subscribed-to-items, wherein the changes are filtered based on a meta-data value of at least one of the subscribed-to-items (see col. 11, lines ; wherein the event is processed before it reaches the target object (i.e. filtered by the filtering module based on data about the item)).

It would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, having teachings of Hobbs and Armstrong et al. before him/her, to combine the features as disclosed by Hobbs with the features as disclosed by Armstrong et al. to provide an event-driven communications interface to support communications between multiple logical partitions in a logically portioned computer (see Armstrong et al., col. 2, line 40-42).

As to claim 44, Hobbs, do not explicitly disclose:

wherein a subscription context is made available to event path plug-ins, content

monitors, event filters, and event handlers with access selected from at least one

of: access to a live content integration middleware session, access to a live

Art Unit: 2166

workflow integration middleware session, access to a statistics reporting API, access to an error reporting API, access to a logging API, and access to the active subscription for the plug-in

However, Armstrong et al. discloses:

wherein a subscription context is made available to event path plug-ins, content

monitors, event filters, and event handlers with access selected from at least one of: access to a live content integration middleware session, access to a live workflow integration middleware session, access to a statistics reporting API, access to an error reporting API, access to a logging API, and access to the active subscription for the plug-in (see col. 5, lines 65-67 - col. 6, line 1 and col. 7, lines 61-64; wherein an event handler sends an acknowledgement in the form of a subscription).

It would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, having teachings of Hobbs. and Armstrong et al. before him/her, to combine the features as disclosed by Hobbs. with the features as disclosed by Armstrong et al. to provide an event-driven communications interface to support communications between multiple logical partitions in a logically portioned computer (see Armstrong et al., col. 2, line 40-42).

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13, 24-27, 29-32, 39-45, 48, and 50 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.




**Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Johnese Johnson whose telephone number is 571-270-1097. The examiner can normally be reached on 4/5/9.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
15 August 2007  
JJ

  
**HOSAIN ALAM**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**